

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/677,902	YAO, JOSEPH	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ali Alavi	2875	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ali Alavi. (3) _____
 (2) John McGlew. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 16 August 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Harris, Frost, and Miller.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner questioned the patentability of independent claim 1 over Harris in view of newly discovered Frost and Miller, Frost discloses the missing the skeleton legs that are collapsible about an axis. Frost teaches that is known Christmas tree stand configuration and one of ordinary skill in the art would have employed it motivated by frost's stated benefits to storage space. The other missing element from Harris is the adjustable height tubes insertable in the trunk. Miller teaches that using different lengths of tubing to adjust the height of an artificial Christmas tree is known. one of the device of Harris motivated by the benefits to versatility in enabling height adjustment as taught by Miller.

However, we agreed to amend claim 1 by adding a limitation that makes the claim 1 clearly patentable over the combined references of Harris, Frost and Miller (see Examiner's Amendment).